



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/533,414

04/29/2005

Brent Daniel Rogers

6682-66957-02

4172

46395 7590 02/09/2007

CARGILL, INCORPORATED

LAW DEPARTMENT

P. O. BOX 5624

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-5624

EXAMINER

HENRY, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1623

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

02/09/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/533,414

Applicant(s)

ROGERS ET AL.

Examiner

Michael C. Henry

Art Unit

1623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/29/05 & 02/01/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed complies with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. It has been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Claims 1-21 are pending in application

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16 and 21 recite the phrase “per serving”. However, the claim is indefinite because it is unclear what amount or quantity of NAG constitutes a serving. Claim 14 recites the phrase “adding a first amount of NAG”. However, the claim is indefinite because the claim does not recite when a second amount was added. Claim 19 recites the phrase “wherein a second amount of NAG present in the NAG food product”. However, the claims are indefinite because it is unclear what constitutes a second amount since claim 19 nor claim 14 (on which claim 19 depends) does not disclose that a second amount was added and since it is unclear whether two amounts of NAG exist in said composition.

Art Unit: 1623

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Troyano et al. (Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry (1996), 44(30), pages 815-817).

In claim 1, applicant claims “A beverage comprising: a heat pasteurized NAG beverage, wherein the beverage comprises at least about 0.01 g NAG per serving. Claims 2 is drawn to said beverage comprising specific mg range of NAG per serving. Claims 2-5 are drawn to said beverage, wherein said beverage is at specific temperature ranges. Claim 20 is drawn to the beverage of claim 1, wherein the NAG comprises at least 1% of a sweetener.

Troyano et al. disclose a beverage (milk) comprising: a heat pasteurized NAG beverage (milk), wherein the beverage comprises at least about 4.4 ± 1.42 mg NAG per 100 ml (see Table 1, page 816). Troyano et al. do not explicitly disclose the grams (g) of NAG per serving in their beverage. But, the silence of Troyano et al. does not mean that their composition does not contain the same said grams of NAG per serving. Troyano et al. anticipates the claims if their

Art Unit: 1623

composition has the same grams of NAG per serving. Troyano et al. renders the claims as being obvious if the grams of NAG per serving in their composition is substantially close to the grams of NAG per serving in applicant's composition. It should be noted that the volume or amount that constitutes a serving is not specified by applicant. Claims 3-5 are also encompassed by this rejection since Troyano et al.'s silence with respect to the temperature of the pasteurized beverage does not mean that their composition does not have the same temperature as applicant's composition. In fact, it should be noted that Troyano et al. composition may well be at the same temperature as applicant especially since pasteurization of beverages or liquids are usually done at similar high temperatures in order to carry out the pasteurization and to be considered as being a pasteurized beverage or liquid. Claim 20 is also encompassed by this rejection since Troyano et al.'s composition also contains other sugars (sweeteners) (see Table 1, page 816).

Claims 10-17, 19, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Matahira et al. (EP 1075836 A2).

In claim 10, applicant claims a food product comprising: a NAG food product comprising at least about 0.01 g NAG per serving, wherein the NAG food product is at a temperature of at least about 160°F; and an absence of shellfish proteins. Claim 11 is drawn to said food product wherein the food product is as a specific temperature range. Claim 12 is drawn to said food product wherein the food product is a flour- or grain-based product. Claim 13 is drawn to said food product wherein the food product comprises specific mg range of NAG per serving. Claim 21 is drawn to a non-acidic food product comprising specific grams of NAG at specific temperature range.

Art Unit: 1623

Matahira et al. disclose a food product (cookie) comprising NAG (see page 13, Table 12,). Matahira et al. do not explicitly disclose the grams(g) of NAG per serving in their food product. But, the silence of Matahira et al. does not mean that their composition does not contain the same said grams of NAG per serving. Matahira et al. anticipates the claims if their composition has the same grams of NAG per serving. Matahira et al. renders the claims as being obvious if the grams of NAG per serving in their composition is substantially close to the grams of NAG per serving in applicant's composition. It should be noted that the amount or quantity that constitutes a serving is not specified by applicant either. Claims 11 and 12 are also encompassed by this rejection since Matahira et al. silence with respect to the temperature of the food product does not mean that their composition does not have the same temperature as applicant's composition, and since Matahira et al.'s food product is also a flour-based product (see page 13, Table 11). Claim 20 is also encompassed by this rejection since Matahira et al.'s composition is also a non-acidic food product (see page 13, Table 11).

In claim 14, applicant claims a method of preparing a food product, comprising providing a food product; adding a first amount of NAG derived from fungal biomass containing chitin to the food product to form a NAG food product, wherein the NAG food product comprises at least about 0.01 g NAG per serving; and heating the NAG food product to a temperature of at least about 160°F. Claims 15-17 are drawn to the method of claim 14 wherein heating involves baking, broiling or boiling, wherein the first amount of NAG present in the food product is a specific amount of grams per serving, wherein the food product is heated at to at least a specific temperature. Claim 19 is drawn to the method of claim 14, wherein the second amount of NAG present in the NAG food product is at least of a specific percentage.

Art Unit: 1623

Matahira et al. disclose a method of preparing a food product (a cookie), comprising adding NAG derived from chitin to a food product to form a NAG food product (a product containing NAG), wherein the NAG food product comprises at least about 0.01 g NAG (i.e., 80 g) and wherein the NAG food product is heated (see page, 13, example 7). Matahira et al. disclose that their product is prepared by a conventional method (see page, 13, example 7). Matahira et al. do not explicitly disclose the grams (g) of NAG per serving in their food product nor the temperature of heating. But, the silence of Matahira et al. does not mean that their composition does not contain the same said grams of NAG per serving and were not heated at the same said temperature. It should be noted that applicant claims does not specify or recite the amount or quantity that equals a serving and that since Matahira et al.'s NAG food composition is a cookie then the said composition must have been heated at a temperature of at least 160°F by baking. Matahira et al. anticipates the claims if their composition has the same grams of NAG per serving and is heated at the same temperature. Matahira et al. renders the claims as being obvious if the grams of NAG per serving and the temperature of heating of their composition is substantially close to the grams of NAG per serving and the temperature of heating of applicant's composition. It should be noted that the amount or quantity that constitutes a serving is not specified by applicant. In addition, the source of the NAG used does render applicant's NAG different from Matshira et al.'s NAG. It should be noted that claim 19 is also encompassed by this rejection since Matahira et al. 's food product may also contain the same percent (%) of NAG (second amount of NAG) after heating, as compared to before heating.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matahira et al. (EP 1075836 A2).

In claim 6, applicant claims a method of preparing a beverage, comprising providing a beverage; adding at least about 0.01g NAG per serving to the beverage to form a NAG beverage; and heat pasteurizing the NAG beverage at a temperature of least about 160°F. Claims 7-8 are drawn to the method of claim 6 wherein the NAG beverage is heat pasteurized at specific temperature range and wherein the amount of NAG present in the beverage is a specific amount of mg per serving. Claim 9 is drawn to the method of claim 6, wherein the NAG present is derived from a specific source.

Matahira et al. disclose a method of preparing a beverage (a drink), comprising adding NAG derived from chitin to a beverage to form a NAG beverage (a beverage containing NAG), wherein the NAG beverage comprises at least about 0.01 g NAG (i.e., 1000 mg or 1 g) and wherein the NAG (see page 14, example 10). Matahira et al. disclose that their beverage can be prepared by conventional method (see page 14, example 10).

The difference between applicant's claimed method and the method of Matahira et al. is that Matahira et al. do not heat-pasteurize their beverage. However, it common in the art to pasteurize (heat-pasteurize) a beverage or other food in order to kill undesired microorganisms

Art Unit: 1623

such as bacteria, viruses, protozoa, molds or yeast that could cause disease, spoilage, or undesired fermentation and to protect the consumer's health. This fact is supported by applicant who disclose that heat pasteurization is used to reduce the presence of undesirable microorganisms and disclose high temperatures that are typically used in heat-pasteurization (see page 4, last two paragraphs of applicant's specification).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed invention was made to have used the method of Matahira et al. to prepare a beverage comprising NAG and to heat-pasteurize said beverage so as to kill any microorganisms present that could cause disease or spoilage and to protect the consumer's health.

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated, to use the method of Matahira et al. to prepare a beverage comprising NAG and to heat-pasteurize said beverage so as to kill any microorganisms present that could cause disease or spoilage and to protect the consumer's health. It should be noted that the source of the NAG used as recited in claim 9 does render applicant's NAG different from Matshira et al.'s NAG. Furthermore, the use of specific temperature of heat-pasteurizing depends on factors such as the time of heating and the type and amount of microorganisms that may be present in said composition. Also, it should be noted that the amount or quantity that constitutes a serving is not specified by applicant.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Henry whose telephone number is 571-272-0652. The examiner can normally be reached on 8.30am-5pm; Mon-Fri. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia A. Jiang can be

Art Unit: 1623

reached on 571-272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael C. Henry


Shaojia Anna Jiang, Ph.D.
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1623

February 3, 2006.